



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of its fundamental concept. The proper description of sociology I conceive to be this: it is a pseudo-science, which was produced by hasty, speculative methods of applying natural science to the interpretation of human society, and which possesses a methodological scheme that exhibits logical consistency, but is completely vitiated by the falsity of its premises. The greatest single gain that could be made in scientific progress toward the solution of the problems with which sociology undertakes to deal, would be to get rid of sociology, since it is essentially a false start. Those who yield to its plausible pretensions go astray.

EDITORIAL NOTE

Professor Ford's confession that he prefers obscurity in the company of Oxford and Cambridge to unbiased search for the light, is not the only proof in his paper that there is no common ground for argument between him and the sociologists. His contention amounts first to the claim that a knowledge problem must be solved before work upon it can have scientific value. That is, a generalization must have been reached which may serve as an *a priori* to explain all the phenomena. This flatly rules inductive processes out of the pale of science. It puts dogmatism in place of research by test of all possible hypotheses. According to Professor Ford, therefore, all the science in existence has come into being by an unscientific process.

In the second place, Professor Ford demands acceptance of the *a priori* that *the state existed before the individual*. This is like denying scientific value to biology until it solves the riddle of the priority of chick or egg, and deduces the details of biological knowledge from that *a priori*. Inasmuch as we have not discovered the missing link, and do not know its habitat and its habits, we should be somewhat premature, whether we called ourselves sociologists or anything else, in being as sure as Professor Ford is about things which nobody knows. What we do know is that wherever human experience has been observed one of its elements has been an incessant reciprocating process between individuals and their groupings. The sociologists are trying to do for this process precisely what the physicists are now trying to do for radio-activity. That is, they are testing every possible hypothesis which may help to explain what it is, and how it is, and why it is.

A. W. S.